

- 15 -

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-45 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hammack (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,624). Applicant respectfully disagrees with such rejection, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove to each of the independent claims. Specifically, applicant has amended each of the independent claims to at least substantially include the subject matter of former dependent Claims 3, and 7-8 et al.

With respect to at least a portion of the independent claims, the Examiner has relied on col. 12, lines 25-36; col. 14, lines 34-47, and col. 21, lines 33-49 from the above reference to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "comparing code operable to compare an XML data representation of said program configuration data with data defining valid program configuration data" (see this or similar, but not necessarily identical language in at least a portion of the independent claims).

However, Hammack merely suggests a comparison method enabling "a user to compare the differences between any two versions and return the process to a desired prior configuration version" (see col. 3, lines 41-46). Thus, it is noted that Hammack does not necessarily designate one version as valid and other as not valid. To this end, Hammack clearly does not even suggest applicant's claimed "comparing code operable to compare an XML data representation of said program configuration data with data defining valid program configuration data" (emphasis added), as claimed.

The Examiner is reminded that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.* 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

- 16 -

This criterion has simply not been met by the above reference, as noted above. Nevertheless, despite such paramount deficiencies and in the spirit of expediting the prosecution of the present application, applicant has amended each of the independent claims to include the following subject matter of former Claims 3, and 7-8 et al., in order to further distinguish applicant's claim language from the above reference:

“wherein mapping code is operable to map between said program configuration data and said XML data representation of said program configuration data;

wherein said mapping code is operable to map between said program configuration data and said XML data representation via a DOM data representation of said program configuration data;

wherein editing code is operable to edit said DOM data representation of said program configuration data to provide modified program configuration data to be validated” (see this or similar, but not necessarily identical language in each of the independent claims).

With respect to the subject matter of former Claims 3 and 7-8 et al. (now at least substantially incorporated into each of the independent claims), the Examiner has relied on the following excerpts from the above reference to make a prior art showing.

“To generate the textual information representative of the configuration version, the VCAT system 98 executes a routine that generally accesses the version control database 102 to export the pertinent data in a manner that can be translated into either a text- or graphical-based format. To this end, during a check-in operation, the VCAT system 98 stores a text-based representation of the version control data in a file in accordance with a markup language, such as XML (Extensible Markup Language). The text contained in the XML document that is generated at this point may be serialized into a single character string that is stored in the version control database 102. More particularly, in one embodiment, each versionable item may have a database record corresponding to each configuration version. In that case, each configuration version record has a field dedicated to having a single character string of XML text stored therein that represents the version control data associated with the configuration version.” (Col. 21, lines 33-49)

- 17 -

After a careful review of the foregoing excerpt and the remaining Hammack reference, however, there is clearly not even a suggestion of a map between program configuration data and an XML data representation of the program configuration data, let alone via a DOM data representation of the program configuration data. Even still, there is absolutely no suggestion of editing code operable to edit the DOM data representation of the program configuration data to provide modified program configuration data to be validated. Only applicant teaches and claims such a combination of features and components for enhanced validation of configuration data.

Again, the foregoing anticipation criterion has simply not been met by the above reference, as noted above. Thus, a notice of allowance or specific prior art showing of each of the foregoing claim elements, in combination with the remaining claimed features, is respectfully requested.

Applicant further notes that the prior art is also deficient with respect to the dependent claims. For example, with respect to Claim 4 et al., the Examiner has relied on the excerpts above from Hammock to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed technique "wherein said data defining valid program configuration data is one of: XSD data defining a valid XML data representation; and DTD data defining a valid XML data representation" (see this or similar, but not necessarily identical language in each of the independent claims).

It appears that the Examiner has simply failed to take into consideration the full weight of applicant's claims. Specifically, there is absolute no suggestion of XSD nor DTD data, let alone such particularly claimed subject data defining a valid XML data representation, or data defining valid program configuration data. Again, the foregoing anticipation criterion has simply not been met by the above reference, as noted above.

- 18 -

Still yet, applicant brings to the Examiner's attention the subject matter of new Claims 46-48 below, which are added for full consideration:

"wherein the map includes a mapping between keys in an operating system registry to complex data types within said DOM data representation" (see Claim 46);

"wherein values in an operating system registry are mapped to simple data types within said DOM data representation" (see Claim 47); and

"wherein an operating system registry is parsed to identify a plurality of keys and types for associating attributes with a plurality of different instances" (see Claim 48).

A notice of allowance or specific prior art showing of each of the foregoing claim elements, in combination with the remaining claimed features, is respectfully requested.

Thus, all of the independent claims are deemed allowable. Moreover, the remaining dependent claims are further deemed allowable, in view of their dependence on such independent claims.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAIIP448/02.030.01).

Respectfully submitted,
Zilka-Kotab, PC.

Kevin S. Zilka
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172-1120
408-505-5100